



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III.—ON THE RECESSION OF THE LATIN ACCENT IN CONNECTION WITH MONOSYLLABIC WORDS AND THE TRADITIONAL WORD-ORDER.

PART III.

PLAUTINE USAGE IN DACTYLIC AND CRETIC GROUPS.

In a discussion of dactylic and cretic word-groups it is important to bear in mind the following facts respecting the use of dactylic and cretic word-forms: the first foot admits *pectóre pectóri, pēctōrē, pēctōri* (for the last, v. Seyffert in Bursian's Jahresb. 1894, p. 263; Skutsch, Sat. Viadrin., p. 142, n. 1; Ahlberg, De corrept., p. 40f.); other feet admit rarely *pectóre* (Klotz, Grundz., 274 ff.), very rarely *pectōri* (Klotz, 63, 277; Seyffert, l. l., 262 vs. Ahlberg, l. l., 46), rarely *pēctōrē* (v. examples in Maurenbrecher, Hiatus, 26), very rarely *pēctōri* (cf. Ahlberg, l. l., 47, who needlessly emends). We wish to use these facts as tests in order to determine what dactylic and cretic groups approach the treatment of single words.¹ In making this test, it is important to remember in general that no one of the restrictions upon the use of cretic and dactylic words in iambic verse is of an absolute character, and especially that Lachmann's law, which excludes *pēctōrē* and *pēctōri*, is occasionally disregarded. Dactylic groups—at least those of the more casual kind—are different in two important respects from tribrach groups; for they neither acquire the recessive accent so completely as the latter (TAPA. XXXIV 76), nor observe it so strictly after it has been acquired. Thus the dramatists have in general only *pól ego*, but they admit in all the feet either *hērcle ego* or *hērcle égo* (the latter Cas. 568; 809, etc.; v. also Kellerhoff, Studem. Stud. II 60), either *átque ego* or *atque égo* (Poe. 1238, etc.), either *ní magis* or *ní mágis* (Hau. 1018). Even some of the common phrases of the later language had not acquired a fixed accent in Pl.'s time; thus *utpote* is expressly named as a *compositum* by Priscian, K. III

¹ I no longer accept the 'decomposition' of dactylic words into their constituent parts, e. g. *ne sclo*, in the extreme manner assumed in TAPA., 1903, p. 68.

68, 12, but we find in Pl. *ut póte* 3 times (Mi. 530; Ci. 317; Ba. 511 (?)), *ut póte* once (Ru. 462); cf., for its meaning in Pl., Lindsay on Cap. 398. The cases just named show a variable accent; a second and a smaller class of cases show a fixed accent outside of the first foot, but non-observance of Lachmann's law. Here belong *át tamen*, *ét tamen*, *séd tamen*, *verúm tamen*, *nihiló minus* (A. J. P. XXV 264) *nón eni(m)* (12 times in dialogue metres, v. Langen, Beitr., 264, and Seyffert, Bursian's Jahresb., 1890, p. 23, n. 1), *súmne egō* (8 times, v. Kellerhoff, Studem. Stud. II 54), *dúmmōdō* (Afran. fr. 409;—strictly treated in Pl. Au. 239; Mi. 253; 783), *póstmōdō* (Hec. 208), and probably also sometimes the *composita* formed by *quidem* with the demonstr. pronouns, as Hau. 89 *hác-quidēm caúsa* (cf. Ahlberg, Procel. I 66–78). There is an unmistakable tendency, then, in the case of most improper *composita* which do not form absolute words, to waive the difficult application of Lachmann's law. At the same time, in the case of not a few frequent combinations, the tendency to observe the law manifests itself quite as clearly as in the case of single words. Such combinations may be conveniently divided into four classes:

I. SPECIAL PHRASES.—These phrases are *entibi*, *vaemihi*, *vaetibi*, *eimihi*, *sūosibi*, *tamcito*¹, *hausecus*, *iamdiu*, etc. Thus the idiomatic combination *em tibi* is very freely separable, as Poe. 382 *ém volúptatém tibi*, but is treated strictly whenever it is used in its regular order; e. g. *em tibi* only once in 1st ft. (Ru. 463), *éntibí* 3 times *med. v.* (Am. 777; Cur. 195; Tru. 952), 6 times in close, *éntib[i]* ^ú 13 times; v. references in Richter, Studem. Stud. I 488 ff. Similar (Richter, ib. 632) is the treatment of *vaémihí* and *vaétibí* (13 times; 4 times *med. v.*, viz. As. 924; Mer. 161; Ps. 631; Cas. 115); *eímihí* (ib. 470) conforms to Lachmann's law 27 times (8 times *med. v.*), and disregards it twice *med. v.*, viz. Mo. 265; Ad. 323 (Dz. ei mi); (St. 753 is usually corrected; Mo. 395 is 1st ft.); cf. also Seyffert, Pl. Stud., p. 9, n. 8. Similarly in the phrase *suus sibi* we find regularly (Müller, Nachtr., p. 60; Scherer, Studem. Stud. II 107) *sūō-sibí*, *sūōm-sibí*, *mēā-mihí*, etc.; cf., however, Cap. 81 *sūó sibi súco*. We find always also *tám cito* (*tan cito* CIL. VI, 6182) and *quám*

¹Similarly quamprimum is treated as one word, i. e. we have quamprimumque, cf. Krebs-Schmalz, Antibarbar. II 410; so also either tantos tam praecipitisque casus (Cic. De or. 3, 4, 13) or tantos tamque praecipitis, cf. Riemann, Syntaxe Lat.,⁴ p. 506.

citó (4 times *med. v.*, viz. Mo. 541; And. 474; 928; Laber. fr. 133), and in general only *iāmdīū*, *quāmdīū*, *tāmdīū* (*iāmdīū* and *tāmdīū* in 1st ft.: Per. 822; Poe. 1266); cf., however, *et dīz*, Mi. 723; *iamdīū* Ci. 156 (suspected), v. Müller, Pr. 170; finally always *haū secūs* (3 times in verse-close: Poe. 835; Ru. 410; Titin. com. fr. 181); cf. *med. v. sīn secūs*, *nēc secūs* Cas. 377; As. 943.

From these examples we are justified in drawing the following conclusions: (1) A distinct tendency exists to observe Lachmann's law in connection with certain dactylic groups. (2) The existence of the tendency is no more disproved by an occasional exception in the case of the word-groups than the existence of the original 'law' is disproved by an occasional exception in the case of single words.¹ As to the character of the word-groups in question, they apparently vary somewhat in the degree in which they have gained the value of single words, so that we find in the Latin sentence dactylic word-groups in many different stages of development.

II. S.-I. CONJUNCTION + NOUN.—In these combinations we find occasional traces of the observance of Lachmann's law; thus the recognition of final *s* in making position is more frequent than in the case of adverbs, but less frequent than in the case of verbs. E. g. Mer. 695 *ēēd coquōs* (acc. to Leo, Forsch., 272, the only case of iambic *coquos* in Pl.); Ps. 1268^a *átque erūs minór* (cf., however, *átque ěrūs*, As. 430; Cap. 200; Men. 1070); Am. 30; Cas. 163; Mo. 849; Poe. 277; St. 721; Pacuv. tr. fr. 38. Even in the case of adverbs we sometimes find similar examples, as Cur. 305 *haūd magi's*; Men. 594.

III. PRONOUN + NOUN.—The prefixed demonstr., relative or interrog. pronoun receives as a rule the grammatical accent; for the dramatists here avoid *quí-mōdūs*, *quód-gēnūs* either by allowing final *s* to make position in iambic words, as *quí-modūs*, *quód-genūs*², or by changing the normal order to *gēnus quod*,

¹ As is well-known, the 'law' is strictly observed by the classical poets and only occasionally violated by the early dramatists. Maurenbrecher's attempt, *Hiatus*, p. 26 ff., to declare it wholly false on the ground of these exceptions, is ill-considered; in point of fact, Lachmann's law constitutes one of the foundation-pillars of Latin iambic verse-structure, and, in view of the strong temptation which constantly exists to violate it, cases of its actual violation are comparatively few (cf. Ahlberg, *Procel.* I 14, 22).

² Verse-closes like *haēcmanūs*, Per. 225; *hóc itér*, Hec. 194, are convenient for the poet, and hence may be otherwise explained.

lócus híc; occasionally also they employ the accent *íd génus*, *quis déus*. E. g. *quí* (*quís*) *modús* As. 167; Mer. 652; *híc déús* Pl. fr. fab. inc. 45; *híc locús* Mer. 1005; cf. Ph. 818 (verse-close); (cf. *lócus híc* Ba. 82); *quód scelús* Ru. 1005; cf. *quíd patrér* And. 950; *íd genús* Tri. 1046 (*quód gënús* only 1st ft., Cap. 278; cf. *íd génus* Ru. 920); for avoidance of regular prose order (Holtze, Synt. Prisc. Lat. I 387), cf. *génus quod* (*hoc*) Tri. 542; Mo. 623; Poe. 1303; cf. *génus qui* Tri. 676; 678; cf. also *dómus haec* Pomp. com. fr. 101; *púer híc* And. 748. Only two exceptions to Lachmann's law have been observed: *hóc önüs ómne* Ba. 499; *haéc bona nóbis* Eu. 1049;—*sitit haéc äñüs*, Cur. 103, is the reading of P, but Festus gives *anus haéc sitit*. Examples of the less usual accent, as in *quis déus*, are as follows: Ci. 669 *án quis de²us*; Men. 558 *quae bóna*; Inc. inc. tr. fr. 217 *haec lóca*; Ad. 884;—this accent is quite normal when the enclitic copula is attached: St. 395 *qui déus-sis*; And. 792 *híc sócer est*; Ph. 732 *haec ánus est*. A similar accent accompanied by syllable-shortening is admitted in dialogue metres only in the 1st ft., e. g. *huic ánú* Cur. 104; *huíusmódĭ* Ps. 1273;—*quomódo* and *quómódö*: Mo. 462; Tri. 602; 855; Ep. 706, cf. Müller, Pl. Pr., 202 f., and Nilsson, Pronom. collocat., 61, n. 1; so also the penult may act as Brevis Brevians only in 1st ft., as Eu. 716 *quómodo hñc* (scan Mi. 95 *quómódo ád hñc*). The isolated example *huic sēñĭ*, Au. 822, may be compared perhaps with *susci⁷tēt* (Ru. 922), *abstĭñĕ* (Cas. 229), etc.; Poe. 853, *hanc mōrām* (A), is usually corrected; Ba. 1140^b, *hae<c> oves*, is to be scanned with Ritschl as *bacch.*; we find also once (Per. 402) *híc dĕs praetĕrierĭt*, just as we find once *iam dĕŭ* Dionýsiá, Ci. 156, but it is perhaps more probable that we should here admit spondaic words in the 4th ft. before the quinesyllabic closing word, i. e. *hicdĕs praetĕrierĭt*, etc. On the other hand, *híc-diēs*, *hunc-diēm*, *hi-lócĭ*, etc., are frequent scansions in anapaests, e. g. Au. 722; Per. 768; Poe. 1268^b; Ci. 226; Ps. 595, v. Müller, Pr., 99 ff., 194, but in dialogue verse *hunc-diem*, *hunc-senem*, etc., clearly form almost a single word. Thus *hunc senem* occurs 5 times in Pl., twice with elision into an acute (Au. 171; Mi. 1183); *hunc diem* (this order is almost invariable, cf. Schrader, De partic. -ne, p. 9, n. 1) occurs 29 times in Pl., 6 times with elision into an acute (Mer. 585; Ps. 128; 547; 621; St. 421; Tri. 961); cf. below, p. 417 f. Similarly we have the three apparent double iambic verse-closes (quadrisyllabic words): Cur. 204. Per. 689 *ād (m) hūncdiēm*; St.

76 *ad hincmōdum*¹. It is probable also that when Seneca elides the final syllable of *hoc-specu*, *hac-manu* (Müller, R. M.², 341), he is dealing with cretic rather than iambic words. Possessive pronouns also regularly receive the accent; so always in *mī pater*, yet we find *mī patrēr* St. 90; Ru. 1175, but also *mī patrēr*, Poe. 1294, *meī patrīs*, Eu. 1048.

IV.—MONOSYLLABLE + VERB.—The rule of accent which arises naturally in simple cases like *quōd-facis*, *tū-facis*, *sī-facis*, is extended to the case of all monosyllables prefixed to the verb²; we may even conjecture with probability that the Latin recessive accent at this point is a partial survival of the I. E. verbal 'enclisis', cf. the Greek recessive accentuation in *σύμ φερε*. The actual existence of the recessive accent is clearly shown by the frequent use of the weak final *s* to make position in combinations like *quōd-facīs*, *quōd-cupīs*, etc., a license which is rare in all iambic words (Leo, Forsch., 268 ff.), and freely admitted only in cases of metrical necessity, as in dactylic word-forms (filiūs), and, for the purpose of avoiding the trochaic procel., in the sequence $\text{˘} \text{˘} \text{˘} \text{˘}$ (*bēne facīs*). It is important to note that the scansion *fācis*, which is excluded after monosyllables, is quite frequent after polysyllables, e. g. Ep. 326 *ābsurde² fācis* qui āngas; ib. 691 *tibi mora^m fācis* quom ēgo; Cur. 305 *haūd magi²s cūpīs* quam ēgo; cf. Ci. 787 *mōre maiora^m date*. This whole usage may be illustrated by the treatment of *facis* in the dramatists: We find the type *quōd facīs med. v.* 3 times (Ter. and Acc.), viz. And. 393 *haec quae facīs*; Hec. 739 *nam sī facīs*; Acc. fr. 487 *id quōd faci⁶s*;—*quōd facīs med. v.* twice (Ter.), viz. And. 322 *sī id faci²s*, hodiē; 522 *ūt faci⁴s*: et id spēro; cf. Eu. 265 *quīd faci^t aliēnus* (iamb. sept.);—*quōd facīs* in verse-close 10 times, viz. Am. 499; Au. 222; Ba. 379; Men. 716; 721; 735; Tri. 634; Tru. 145 (hemistich-close); And. 727; Hau. 107;—*haēc-fācis*

¹ Klotz' view (Grundz. 245f.) that preceding *elision*, as Cur. 204 *quaeso ad hūncdiē*, justifies a double iambic verse-close, is wholly unfounded and gives evidence of a strange confusion of ideas. *A double iambic verse-close is only justified in the case of those monosyllabic groups in which no elision takes place at all*, as Luchs, in the original enunciation of his law, most clearly states (Studem. Stud. I 18). E. g. Ps. 800 *sī ēras cōquós*, where no elision occurs in the group *sī-eras*, which in prose (if unelided) is always accented *sī-eras*.

² For the treatment of monosyll. and verb as one word, cf. also Cic. De fin. 1, 47 *quid faciendum non faciendumve* sit; Rep. 5, 2, 3 *agri qui essent regi, qui colerenturque* (needlessly corrected by Dräger, Hist. Syntax II 35); Cap. 387 *id petam <que> id persequarque* (so Niemeyer).

occurs only in anapaests, as St. 326^b. Against these 15 cases of *quód facis* we find only 2 cases of the less usual accent *quod fácis*, viz. Tri. 362 *íd nunc fá⁵cis* (1st ft.); Hec. 692 *et fácis*; cf. Cap. 834 *nec fácit nec* (1st ft.); cf. Acc. fr. 504 *íd fá²cit*. Further, just as *fíngerē* (As. 250) is always a permissible scansion of a dactylic word-form (A. J. P. XXV 262, n. 1), so *vél facē*, Per. 398, is quite defensible (ed. min. corrects needlessly to *vél <me> fáce*); cf. also Cap. 200 *quaé fá⁵cit*. || Oh óh oh (with change of speaker), and, acc. to some, Tru. 555 *domíst qui facit inprobe* (bacch.; MSS inprobă).

Quite similar is the treatment of *eris, cupis, petis, datis, fugis, agis, ais, sapis*, etc. Thus *eris* (*erís*) occurs *med. v.* 5 times, viz. As. 870; Poe. 1228; Ps. 337; Tru. 958, and, without position, Tri. 971 *ú⁵mquam eri²s* auro huíc; *eris* occurs once: Ci. 50 *saépe éris súmptu*. [Cf. also *erit* Men. 956; Tri. 694; Eu. 484. Exceptions, however, sometimes occur, viz., Tri. 503 *níl erát dícto*; Mi. 1176 *ho²c erit fáctum*; Tru. 190 *iám fore*; Tri. 976 *no²n erás*,—the last usually corrected.] So we find *quód petís* in 1st ft. Mi. 231;—otherwise *quód petís* (*petís*), *quód datís*, etc. *med. v.* 6 times (Ps. 1313; Cas. 765; Per. 855^a; Mo. 524; Au. 415);—sometimes *quód-petís*, etc., without position, as Cur. 363 *quód cupí²s*; Eu. 12 *quí petí²t* (Umpf., with A C¹ P); cf. Cur. 643 *quaé fú⁴it*. || Archéstratá (change of speaker). *Quám rem agís, níl agís únde agís, hóc agé*, etc., regularly stand in the verse-close, but occur also twice *med. v.*, viz. Ru. 996; Per. 482;—most editors correct Cas. 143 (*níl agēs*) and Ru. 1053 (*níl agö*); *hóc áge* (Mi. 1114) and *hóc ágē* (perhaps Cap. 444) occur in the 1st ft. We find *áis* freely after polysyllables (Mi. 337; 366, etc.), but only *quíd t[u] áís* (10 times, v. Lodge, Lex. Pl., p. 87); so without position and without change of speaker, Cap. 1016 *quíd tu áís*; cf. Hau. 887 *quós áís homínés*. Similarly the phrase *sí sapis* has always the initial accent—15 times in verse-close, twice *med. v.* as *sí sapís* (Ba. 1027; Cas. 838), twice exceptionally as *sí sápis* (Am. 311, 1st ft.; Mo. 1173); cf. Poe. 1200 *hínc sapí²t* (without position); 1198 *út sapí²t* (end of colon); in the 1st ft. we find also *quae sápit* in, Tru. 854. With *sí-sapis*, cf. also the familiar *sivis, sis, sultis, sodes*.

Again, although Pl. scans *sciō, volō*¹ quite as frequently as *sciō*,

¹ The cases of shortening fall into 3 classes: (1) *with* the aid of the verse-accent, i. e. *sciō*, in all parts of the verse (so most frequently); (2) *without* the verse-accent, and in the 1st ft. (frequent); (3) *without* the verse-accent, and

volō, he admits in general only *sciō*, *volō* after monosyllables.¹ Some striking illustrations may be given of this fact: In the usual order Pl. always accents *iām-sciō* (6 times: As. 378; Men. 764; Mer. 266; Ci. 521; Mer. 732; 735; cf. also the frequent *iām sciēs*), but, wishing to utilize the scansion *sciō* for his verse, he changes the order 5 times to *sciō iam*, e. g. Mer. 304 *térnas sciō iam*. *Quíd* (not *térnas iām-sciō*. *Quíd*); ib. 775; Mi. 36; Ps. 990; Tru. 506. Similarly Pl. and Ter. have *té volō* or *té vol[o]* $\underline{\cup}$ 21 times (*med. v.* 6 times), cf. Kellerhoff, Studem. Stud. II 80 ff.; wishing to use the scansion *volō*, Pl. changes the order thrice, e. g. Ep. 460 *émi. vólō te vérbis* (not *té-vólō*); Per. 598; 190;—so also always *mé-volō* (except Mi. 678 *ego-mé vólō*), but twice *vólō me*: Mi. 497; St. 422 (*té vólō* occurs only in anap., Ba. 1149, except for a false correction of Kellerh.). Also, except in anap. and in the 1st ft. of dialogue verse, we find always *nón-queō* or *nón-que[o]* $\underline{\cup}$ (7 times in verse-close, 4 times *med. v.*, viz. As. 907; St. 292; Ad. 738; Hec. 443; cf. also Müller, Nachtr. 23), *nón potést*, etc. (except Mer. 553 *dum pōtes*, but Ps. 85 read *séd potés* (A); cf. Müller, Pr. 131 f.), *níl morór* (27 times, cf. Kellerhoff, l. l., 82 and Müller, Pr. 126 f.), *nón tacés* (11 times, but Hec. 527 *hē'm, tēcēs*), *út valés, út valét*, (9 times), *út solés, út solét* (except Ba. 80 *ut so³let in ístis*), *út lubét, út decét, út iúbés, quód sciám, sí sciás, híc eró*, etc.² Finally, note especially the verses in which this accent occurs more than once, as:

Cas. 765: *Quin ágitis hódie? quín datís, siquíd datís?*

Cur. 148: *Vós amò, vós vólò, vós peto átque óbsecró.*

Mo. 329: *Sí cadēs, nón cadēs, quín cadēm técum.*

med. v. (not infrequent). Although the third class is the least frequent of the three, cases occur quite often enough (Mi. 273; Au. 574; Cap. 440, etc.) to give cogency to the argument offered above.

¹ *Med. v.* the type *ét sciō* occurs 13 times; *ét sci[o]* $\underline{\cup}$ 8 times. In 1st ft. et *sciō* Ci. 588;—Ps. 221 ed. mai. reads *sed sciō* <ego>, a common phrase. *Ét volō med. v.* occurs 17 times; *ét vol[o]* $\underline{\cup}$ 20 times. Exceptions occur in 1st ft., as Ps. 919 *hoc vólō*; Mo. 583; Ci. 82 *ho¹c vólō ágátis*; Au. 823. A real exception is perhaps Men. 207 *scín quid vo²lo ego té*; [also Ter. Hec. 753 *quíd vólō . . . fácias*; Hau. 1027 *aút quod vo³lō*]; but not Tru. 779 *híc nunc vo²lo-scire*; Tru. 261. Mi. 612 *se¹d volō-scire* (for the phrase, v. Lindsay, Captivi, p. 366), nor Mi. 678 *ego-me⁶ volō viveré*. Although excluded after monosyll. accusative (*quod, hoc, te*, etc.), *volō* is frequent after polysyll. acc., as St. 347 *múnditiás volō*; 674; Tru. 283, etc., and is wholly unrestricted in anap.

² Compare also the following examples, which, occurring as they do in Terence, probably involve pyrrhic rather than iambic words (v. Podiaski):

Cf. St. 285 age *út placét*, curre *út lubét*; Poe. 1198 *út sapít*.|| In-génium pátris, habēt *quód sapít*; Au. 657; Men. 116; Per. 482; 578; Ph. 799.

Although iambic imperatives like *cave*, *vide*, *vale*, *abi*, etc., are used in dramatic verse almost exclusively in a shortened form (Müller, Pr. 153; Leppermann, De corrept. Pl., 82), yet, in conjunction with the negative prefix *ne*, we find always *né negá* or *né neg[a]* *úú* (7 times, cf. Loch, Impv. b. Pl., 21; 2 *med. v.*, viz. As. 377; 922;—3 times written in B *nenega*), *né pavé* (4 times; 3 *med. v.*: Am. 1110; Mer. 885; Ps. 103), *né timé* (12 times; 1 *med. v.*, Mi. 1345; 1 cretic, Cas. 835;—3 times written *netime*); *né duís*, *né duás* (6 times; 2 *med. v.*: Mer. 401(?); Ru. 1368), and always in verse-closes *né docé* (except anap., Au. 434), *né crepá*, *né siés*, etc., also always *mé vidé* (Lorenz on Mi. 376; Lindsay, Class. Rev. VI 404). In conjunction with other prefixes, as *intr[o]*, *rus*, *nunc*, *sed*, *vah*, *st*, etc., we have *med. v.* intro *abí* (As. 543; Cap. 452; Ci. 770), *rús abí* (Mo. 8; Cas. 103—the usual punctuation, viz. *rus*, *abi*, is incorrect, cf. Mo. 74); Mo. 585 *núnc tu abí* (MSS: *né tu abí*); Mer. 749 *st, abí*; Ps. 1288 *séd vidé*; Hau. 600 *va'h, vidé*; probably Am. 749 *ha'nc rogá*.|| *Měquidém*;—and often in verse-closes, as Mo. 580 (*núnc abí*), Cap. 125 (*átque abí*), ib. 860 (*séd iubé*), etc. Exceptions to Lachmann's law occur only occasionally *med. v.*, viz. Mo. 66 *tace átque äbí rús*; Ru. 1089 *a²c tăčě tú*; perhaps Mo. 810 *a²h căvě*;—but frequently in 1st ft., as Mo. 929 (*núnc äbí*); 187 (*quín mōně quaěso*); Hau. 1031 (*ét căvě*); Hec. 223; Poe. 609; cf. Cap. 643 (*séd vide-sís*); cf. Poe. 358. The accent *ac căve* (Ba. 147; Hau. 302) is also frequent *med. v.*; further Tri. 11 (*et dâte*); Am. 353; Men. 416; cf. Poe. 292. These examples show that, except in the case of the prohibitive prefix *ne*, the recessive accent is not so usual with the impv. as with other verbal forms, perhaps because some impvs. are often felt as exclamatory adverbs (cf. *cedo*, as Ad. 123 *át cědö*).

With verbal forms in general a few additional exceptions to Lachmann's law occur, viz. Mi. 1272 *út tremit átque*; Tru. 755 *no²n redís*; cf. Cap. 343 *ita-u⁶t velís* (treat otherwise, however, Ps. 479; Cas. 242); — more often in 1st ft., as St. 58 *qui¹ manět út*; Au. 823; Am. 703; cf. Cap. 572. The less usual medial accent is frequent in the 1st ft. (cf. *perlúbět*, Cap. 833), as Tru. 242 *si*

Hau. 1054 *ut té dece³t*. Ea; ib. 666 *nón lice²t hominem ésse*; Phor. 718 *nón moro⁶r*. Ubi; Hau. 1021 *quín sie⁶t itidém*.

négāt se; Ci. 453 nil mōrōr; Per. 50 iamne ābis; 213; Ps. 156; Ba. 1001; Tru. 235, etc., and admissible elsewhere, as St. 710 bībe si bī²bis; Mi. 1314 quīn tu iu³bēs; Mo. 648 has dēdīt qu.; Per. 272 quod da³tūmst; Poe. 374; Ba. 646.

PLAUTINE USAGE IN PREPOSITIONAL COMPOSITA.

No critical scholar at the present day is likely to question seriously the recessive accentuation of the prepositional *composita* (cf. Podiaski, Quomodo Terent. verb. acc., etc., p. 15; Lindsay, Journ. Philol. XX 150 ff., and The Captivi, p. 370; Skutsch, Forsch. 159; Vendryes, L'intensité init. 108). Thus recession is clearly indicated by the frequency with which the assimilated form of the preposition occurs before nouns in Inscr. and MSS, i. e. *al laevam*, *im fronte*, *ec flamma*, etc.; v. Corssen I² 266; II² 871; Neue-Wagener, Formenl. II 783, 868, 905, etc. The chief examples of this sort occurring in the Plautus MSS are brought together by Leo, Nachr. d. Gött. Ges., 1895, p. 419, e. g. *appatrem* Mer. 962 (C D), *impraeda* Ep. 108 (A); *summanus* Per. 450 (B C D), etc.¹; for the occasional assimilation also of conjunctions and other particles, cf. CIL. III suppl. 5, 15184, 13 *pro se es su[is]*; IV 1895 *tan durum*; VI 6182 *tan cito*, etc. The lengthened vowel of the preposition is also abundantly attested for combinations like *IN FORO* (CIL. VI 1566), *INSVOS* (II 1503), *INCOLONIA* (II 1676), etc., cf. Christiansen, De i longis, p. 43 ff.

Tmesis-forms² occur occasionally in poetry, e. g. the caesura after the *praep. adposita* in Cat. IV 18 *per | impotentiā freta* is comparable to that after the *praep. composita* in Hor. C. II 12, 35 *dūm flagrātia dē | torquet*; a looser connection may perhaps be sometimes indicated by the very free occurrence in the hexameter-close³ of tmesis-forms like *inter | agendum*, *ante | domandum* (Verg. Ecl. 9, 24; Georg. 3, 206), but we may note that Silius Italicus uses quite similarly in the hexameter-close *et super | esse* (Müller, R. M.², 264); cf. Hor. Ep. I 19, 3 *ut male | sanus*; cf.

¹ I have not seen J. Dorsch, Assim. in d. Compos. b. Pl., 1887.

² Altogether unwarranted is the view of L. Müller, R. M.², p. 467, who, on the ground of the occasional occurrence of these tmesis-forms, denies that the dactylic poets treat *circumlitōra* and *aboris* as *composita* in the manner described by Quintilian (I 5, 27).

³ Cf. also the observations of Prof. Humphreys, Trans. Am. Phil. Ass. IX (1878), p. 58.

Verg. Georg. 2, 366 *interque legendae*; etc.¹ Finally attention may be directed to the characteristic Latin arrangement, by which the preposition is often placed between the attribute and the noun, e. g. *omnibus in locis, lacrimis cum multis*. Leo, Nachr. d. Gött. Ges., 1895, p. 418, sees in this construction a survival of the original I. E. *postposition* of these particles, which is still largely retained in Oscan and Umbrian. Leo's solution may be the correct one, yet I should like to point out that a different view of the construction is at least possible, and that the Latin order *omnibus in locis* is capable of being explained wholly from the development which has taken place within the Latin domain, and from the tendency which has there prevailed to treat the complex 'preposition-noun' as a unit and to preserve it unbroken in the great majority of cases, e. g. *omnibus inlocis, magna cumlaude* where we have the adjective agreeing with the *compositum inlocis*, etc.

So far we have spoken only of general considerations; in dramatic verse the recessive accentuation of these *composita* is clearly indicated by the following special usages:

(1) We find frequent examples of the oxytonesis of trochaic and spondaic prepositions in the critical feet. E. g. Ps. 648 *intē^rurum*; often *intēreos, praetēreos*² (Ritschl, Proleg. CCXXVII;

¹ Similarly verbal tmesis-forms like *ante | venitis, ante | parata* (which our editors would doubtless in such cases write separately), are probably legitimate in the hexameter-close, although I have had no opportunity to collect such examples. L. Müller himself writes in Cat. IV 4 the tmesis-form *praeter | ire* on account of the caesura; similarly, Horace, C. I 2, 34, has the tmesis-form *circum | volat* in Sapphic verse; on *super | volitantia* in Lucan (V 595), see Trampe, De Luc. arte metr., p. 34. As to the main point at issue, the character of prepositional phrases, it is well-known that in the senarius-close forms like *sine-mora, in-optido* (Phaedr. V 7, 22; III 10, 19, etc.) count as one word (cf. Müller, R. M., 532; Havet, ed. Phaedr., p. 178). Hence H. A. J. Munro, Transactions of the Cambridge Philosoph. Society, X (1864), p. 378, states the facts correctly: "An ancient Latin seems to have been able by the sense alone to distinguish *in justo* from *injūsto* or *praeter missa* from *praeter-missa*". It is scarcely necessary to mention in conclusion the great number of compounds which have arisen from these familiar combinations, e. g. *inforare (in-forum: Plaut.)*, *egregius (e-grege)*, *suburbanus (sub-urbe)*, etc.

² One may note in passing the curious oversight of Ritschl (into which Lorenz and the edd. mai. and min. have also fallen) in conjecturing Mo. 1156 *pu^det | Própter éā quae fécit*. B¹ has *Propterea qui facit*, and if we follow the usual emendation, we can only read *Próptereā quae (or quia) fécit*, cf. And. 414 *id proptereā*.

Klotz, Grundz. 267), *intérse*, *proptérme*,¹ etc. (Klotz, 324);—Enn. tr. fr. 55 *intér deás*; Poe. 1398 *intér negótíúm*; not conclusive is Enn. tr. fr. 201 *ante² pedes* (cf. *ántëpëdës* Mer. 780; Ad. 386), nor Cap. 617 *intér sacrúm*. Hence we find *intér* 'abstracted' from such cases and used alone, as Mer. 752 *quós intér*; possible also is *apúd-forum* Ep. 422, cf. Pompon. fr. 168 R., although Leo, Forsch. 226 f., demands in both these cases the usual *ápü(d) forúm*, with hiatus or slight change of text; cf. also with pyrrhic prep. Ps. 140 *apu^d oveis* [cf. Ci. 50 *sine⁵ mëo*; Poe. 1193 *intér aliás*], though for the sequence $\cup\cup$, $\cup\cup$ we find regularly *ápud erúm* (Am. 591; Cap. 666; Ps. 461; 493, etc.), *ápud eúm* (Hau. 733), etc. The student of Plautine accent will perhaps wonder why it is that we find in the critical feet such numerous cases of the accents *intér-nos*, *ergá-me*, *proptér-res*, etc., where the prep. is followed by a monosyllable, and also numerous cases of the combination $-\cup$, $\cup-$ (*intéreos*), while we find in the critical feet only a few cases like *intér deas*, where the prep. is followed by a dissyllable; the probable explanation of this difference is that nearly all the combinations involving dissyllables are needed for the formation of verse-closes, e. g. St. 460 *præter⁶ pedës*; Mi. 9 *proptér virúm*.

(2) We find always the accents *ápatre*, *inforó*, etc., and not *a pátre*, *in fóro*, cf. A. J. P. XXV 262 f.; corrupt is As. 463 *ípse in mánu* | *habébo*, with hiatus, and Ru. 206 is needlessly scanned by Škutsch, Forsch. 158, *quísquam homó mi obvîám*, instead of *quísquam homó mi óbviám*. Pl. also accents in prep. phrases only *proptér-viám*, *proptér-maré*, *præter-cas[am]*, and never *próptér viám*, *próptér máre*, *præter cás[am]*, although we find the latter accent freely used in all other combinations of the same value ($-\cup$, $\cup-$), e. g. *tánto mágis* (Mo. 831; Ba. 557), *múlto mágis* (Per. 232; Ps. 656), *nílo mágis* (Am. 908; Cas. 264). For *sūprá-lacúm* admitted as a quadrisyllabic word in iambic verse-close, v. Klotz, Grundz. 244; cf. also in the hexameter-close Verg. A. 3, 695 *subtér-mare*, *quí nunc*. Similarly we have

¹ It is noteworthy that the very frequent cases of 'enclisis' in *intéreos*, *intérse*, *præterspem*, etc., are nowhere expressly mentioned by the ancient grammarians, and we must suppose that they regarded such cases as sufficiently provided for by their general rules. To these rules as cited above (A. J. P. XXV 263 f.) add Priscian, K. III 27, 20 (Schöll, De acc., p. 186): *annectitur semper praepositio sequenti dictioni et quasi una pars cum ea effertur, quamvis per appositionem proferatur*.

always *ápūd forūm, sine módō*, and procell. like *apūd forūm, sine módō* (dissyll. noun) are wholly excluded (*sine bōnō* only in anap.¹, e. g. Ru. 937^b), although, if the governed noun is trisyllabic, the use of the procel. is quite frequent, e. g. Hau. 30 *sine vítiis*; Eu. 1044 *sine dúbi[o]*; Pl. fr. inc. 7 *apud hómines* (Ahlberg, Procel. 135 ff., cites 11 such procell.).

(3) If, during the republican period, the accent ever rested upon the noun in combinations consisting of prep. + dissyllabic noun, we ought to find examples of procell. like *ita in mánu*,¹ *quidem in cápūt, et in máre*, etc. We find in fact procell. with just such shortening of the prep., but only² when the governed noun is trisyllabic, e. g. Ru. 1302 *ita in manibus*; 765 *quidem in ca'pite*; Cur. 611 *vel in chla'mydem*; Cap. 1000 *fui in la'pici | dínas* (cf. Ahlberg, Procel. I 139-147, who, however, omits Ru. 765). The accent may not then move forward, but Pl. allows it to freely *recede further* in the case of dissyllabic nouns, esp. in the 1st ft., e. g. Cur. 354 *si'bi in manúm*; Am. 1021; Ps. 1294; Tri. 914, v. still other examples in Müller, Pr. 344; cf. St. 517 *i'n hūnc diém*; Cap. 426 *i'd üt sciás*; Am. 357; Cap. 363. The recession which all these examples exhibit is that of the *quid exprobrás* type (Tri. 318; 250; Eu. 233, etc.).

(4) We find Lachmann's law carefully observed in the prepositional *composita*, i. e. we have either *ápatrē, inforō*, etc. (*med.* and *ult. v.*), or, if the final syllable is elided, elision always³ occurs in dialogue verse⁴ into an acute, that is, we have either $\acute{\cup}$, $\acute{\cup}$ or $\acute{\cup}$, $\acute{\cup}$, but not $\acute{\cup}$, $\acute{\cup}$ (A. J. P. XXV 262). In other words, we may have *sen[em] illúm* (Ba. 1150), but not *ádsen[em] illúm*, *manu émíssus* (As. 411), but not *émanu émíssus*. I have examined, with the help of Rassow's index, a sufficient number of prepositional phrases in Pl. to determine

¹ Hence read with synizesis, Ep. 426 *sine túō labóre* (Ahlberg, l. l., 154); Per. 63 *sine meō períclo*; Mi. 135 *apud súōm paternum*.

² Müller, Pr. 181, wrongly emends the corrupt v. Am. 157 to *neque in érō* (iamb. oct.), and Goetz does little better, i. e. in *érō sit*;—read with synizesis St. 62 *quidem in súō* (Ahlberg, l. l., 154), not *quidem in súō*.

³ Scan Cas. prol. 36 *cúmpatre in illisce*, not in *illisce*; so Mi. 95 *quómodo ád hūnc*, not *quómodo ad hūnc*; Ps. 1242 (Müller, Nachtr. 15) is corrected from A, or may be scanned *óbviam ei últro déferám* (P). Very exceptional is CLE. (Büch.) 231, 2 *i'n mánñ*, cf. *péctōrē*.

⁴ In anap. we have of course *óbviam Ignóbilis* (Ps. 592), *inlōcō* (Per. 843), *húncdiém* (ib. 768) etc., cf. above p. 409.

this fact beyond all question; the results are shown in the following table:

Composita	Elisions Into Acute	Composita	Elisions Into Acute
aforo	5	periovem	2
deforo	1	periocum	2
inforo	4	incrucem	1
adforum	12	invia	2
apatre	6	devia	1
cumpatre	2	propterviam	1
clapatrem	1	obviam	14
adpatrem	5	indiem	3 ¹
adsenem	2	inloco	2
⁊ mare	4	abdomo	2
		Total	72

The cases of the elision of *adforum* into an acute may be cited here: Ba. 902; 1060; Ps. 561; 764; Tru. 313; Mer. 797; Tri. 727; Per. 487; As. 245; 367; Mi. 89; 930; And. 226; 356; Ad. 277; Ph. 312; 921. (*Total*, 17);—similarly *aforo*: Au. 356; Mi. 578; Mo. 998; Per. 442; Poe. 929; Ad. 645;—*inforo*: As. 117; Cur. 475; 507; Tri. 651.

Finally, the prepositions are shown to be accented by the fact that they are often placed in those feet of Latin verse which *conventionally* require a tonic syllable in the arsis, e. g. the fifth arsis of the hexameter, as áb Iove súmmo (Verg. A. 1, 380), and the third arsis of the trimeter, as Laber. mim. 113 ín bono aéque atque ín maló; Syr. sent. 135 cŭm malá famá.

SUMMARY.

The cases of general recession in the Latin accent system are strictly limited in number, that is, recession of this sort occurs only upon monosyllabic pronouns, prepositions, conjunctions and adverbs, and also upon dissyllabic prepositions and pronouns (for the latter, v. Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc., 1904). Further when conjunctions, pronouns and the like are involved, recession occurs often in the word-groups ∪∪, ∪∪ (A. J. P. XXV 160, 260, 269), less often in the groups ∪, ∪∪∪ (TAPA. XXXIV, 93 ff.). The causes of this recession lie in the traditional I. E. word-order,

¹ No. of cases in both Pl. and Ter.

which has been very completely preserved in Latin, and, in a number of instances, they probably lie also in an original I. E. 'enclisis', which has been retained in Latin (A. J. P. XXV 156, 259², 260, 261¹, 263, 410).

Since Latin has preserved no other word-orders in the same degree as those just mentioned, the Latin accent has, in all other cases—except of course in special phrases—acquired a definite place in single words and become a fixed accent (*feste, gebundene Betonung*, v. Seelmann, Ausspr. 18; Hirt, Indogerm. Akz. 19). The suggestion has been made, to be sure, both by Lindsay and by Skutsch in recent writings, in which they have developed the theory of Ritschl to its logical conclusions (Journal of Philol. XX 153; The Captivi, p. 362¹; Forsch. 156 *med.*), that the Latin accent possesses the power of receding over almost any iambic word, e. g. *essum vocat*, and is therefore to a considerable extent a *free accent* (*freie Betonung*). After examining this hypothesis with interest and without adverse prepossessions, I am led to reject it at every point. For it is only in a very limited way that we find evidences of accentuations like *aquám-velim*² (obj. + verb), and we practically find no evidence at all for accents like *rectá-via* (adj. + noun) or *reclé-facis*³ (dissyll. adv. + verb). Hence we must conclude that a general recession of the accent takes place only within certain definite limits.

Further, the conclusions which we have reached are, to a large extent, independent of any very special theory of the Latin accent, but are in accord with certain generally recognized facts of development. For both the stress theory of the Latin accent and the musical theory, in the form in which the latter has been thrown by Havet and Vendryes, agree in assuming that in the

¹ It is scarcely necessary to say that I accept very largely the views which Prof. Lindsay has advocated in the works just cited, but I do not accept the view that in the common pronunciation *any* iambic word can throw its accent back, e. g. *essum-vocat*, *diffraçtós-velim*, *rectá-via*. In general, there is no tendency whatever to make accent and ictus agree in the last dipody of iambic lines (v. Schlicher, A. J. P. XXIII 50, whose statistics unfortunately make no distinct allowance for the numerous cases like *in viam*, *illaéc siet*, *aliquó modo*, etc.), and in accordance with the principle to be stated below, *it is precisely in the last dipody of iambic lines that the developed iambus of Tragedy requires that accent and ictus shall (practically) always disagree*, as H. A. J. Munro acutely pointed out, Journal of Philol. VI 75, and Transactions of the Cambridge Philosophical Society, X 386.

² Cf. A. J. P. XXV 258.

³ Cf. TAPA. 1904, p. 49.

pre-literary period an accent of stress or intensity rested upon the initials. In my judgment, however, these conclusions accord better with the stress theory of the accent (cf. TAPA. XXXIV, p. 95).

CONCLUSION. RELATION OF WORD AND VERSE ACCENT.

The question may be asked whether the conclusions reached in the preceding study throw any light upon the larger problem of the relation which exists between the Latin accent and Latin quantitative verse.¹ Although it is difficult to answer this question within the limits of the present paper, I am unwilling to bring this study to a close without indicating briefly the manner in which I think that its results should be interpreted in relation to the general problem,² which has called forth such wide differences of opinion among Latin metrical scholars. In the first place it will be noted that all the tests which have been employed in the preceding investigation are based upon the well-known fact that the verse-accentuation of *gēnērē*, *prodītio*, *cālāmī*|tatem, *āpē*|rire *pēctorē*³, *impēri*|osus,⁴ etc., must agree with the word-tone. This usage means that, in all ordinary forms of pronunciation, the Latin tone greatly weakened *a following short syllable*, or *two following short syllables*, in case the second of the two shorts was not a final syllable. Now it is true, in general, that the various metrical *tones* or *cadences* of the ancients (ἐξάμετρος τόνος, Hdt. I 47; τρίμετρος τόνος, id. I 174) always involve to some extent the song-like utterance known as the μέση κίνησις or *medium genus* (Aristid. Quint., p. 7, 23 M.; Mart. Cap. IX 937; cf. Quintil. I 8, 2), and are therefore wholly independent of the *tone*⁵ or

¹In this whole discussion I use the term 'accent' in the sense of the grammatical accent, the accent of popular speech (*sermo*). Hence my position would not be affected in the least, even if one should wish to assume with Zielinski, Das Clauselgesetz in Ciceros Reden, Leipzig, 1904, p. 225 ff., the existence of an 'oratorisch-poetischer Accent'; for the real subject of my inquiry is, what relation does this 'oratorisch-poetischer Accent', i. e., in my judgment, the accent which *naturally* accompanies the μέση κίνησις and the πλάσμα, bear to the 'Vulgäaccent'.

²Upon this relation, see also my article "Studies in Latin Accent and Metric", Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc., 1904. A still fuller discussion of the subject is proposed elsewhere.

³From the time of Terence, v. Klotz, Grundz. 276 ff.

⁴From the time of Phaedrus, v. TAPA. XXXIV 67.

⁵Since the Greek and Latin accents have both of them a large melodic element and appear to differ only in the degree in which they have developed

cadence (τόνος, προσφῳδία) of the voice in colloquial speech, independent also, in general, of the weak intensive element of the tone. This independence does not, however, exist in all cases to the same extent; for the ancients are agreed that one of the metrical cadences, viz. the iambic, approaches more nearly than the rest to the tone of colloquial speech. Hence we should expect to discover in iambic verse, if anywhere, traces of the direct influence of the tone, and we are not surprised to find that the poet or poets, who arranged the Latin iambic, imposed upon it from the first the law that it should respect the colloquial tone of *génére, càlami*|tatem and *àpèrire*, and that a similar law was accepted later for *péctorè* and even for *imphèri*|osus.

the intensive element, I have no hesitation in following the Roman custom of applying to Roman pronunciation all those terms which the Greeks employ of their own language, i. e. μέλος, ἁρμονία, τόνος, προσφῳδία, etc. For the sake of brevity and of making my account fit both Greek and Latin verse, I have also intentionally followed the example of many Roman writers and perhaps of Hdt. (cited above) and of Dion. Hal. (De admir. vi Dem. c. 48; De comp. verb. c. 11, cf. Klotz, Grundz. 269 *versus* Crusius, litt. Centralbl. 1891, 7, 213), among Greek writers, in failing to distinguish sharply between ictus, which is 'stress with a slight musical elevation' (Humphreys), and the Greek tone, which is 'musical elevation with a slight stress'. This lack of sharp distinction seems to me legitimate, since, in the μέση κίνησις, the ictus obscures or obliterates the tone, and thus very largely takes its place. In fact, we may safely go considerably beyond the definitions just quoted; see my note on ictus in TAPA., 1904, p. 51 f. To that note I now wish to add the following: Besides the examples of τόνος ('musical mode', 'melody') cited in Stephanus' Thesaurus, note especially Schol. Marciana in artis Dionys. § 2, p. 307, 38 Hilgard: ἔπος λέγεται καὶ τόνος παρά τισιν, "ἐξαμέτρους τοῖς τόνοις κεκρῆσθαι." Again προσφῳδία is apparently never used simply of the ictus, without reference to the musical accompaniment, but, according to the later grammarians, it is freely used of the musical accompaniment and of the tune which, as we know, replaced the speech-tune in singing; cf. Choeroboscus, Graec. Gramm., p. 703 (124, 27 Hilgard): τριχῶς λέγεται ἡ προσφῳδία. καὶ <γὰρ> ἡ παρὰ τοῖς μουσικοῖς, τουτέστι τὸ σόμα καὶ ἡ ἐκφώνησις τῶν αὐλῶν, λέγεται προσφῳδία; Porphyry ib., p. 712 (141, 9 H.) προσφῳδία γὰρ καὶ ἡ χειρονομία καὶ ἡ τοῦ ὀργάνου φωνή, where χειρονομία denotes the 'gestures' of the musician or the actor, and consequently a species of vocal προσφῳδία also appears to be implied for the familiar ῥυθμοὶ σχηματιζόμενοι (Arist. Poet. 1, 6), i. e. the rhythms which are without musical accompaniment but supported by lively gesticulation, cf. Aristid. Q. 32 M. ῥυθμὸς καθ' αὐτὸν ἐπὶ ψιλλῆς ὀρχήσεως.

In conclusion it is not probable that τόνος—at least in the singular number—contains a *direct* reference to the verse-accent, although this interpretation is actually adopted in Passow's Lex.; some more remote connection, however, may probably be traced. As regards the direct meaning of the term, I quite agree with Prof. Humphreys who kindly writes me that in his judgment "τόνος

All the cases named involve the treatment of short syllables following the tone; wherever, on the other hand, long syllables alone are involved, as in *rēgnō*, the Romans were easily able to withdraw¹ the weak colloquial tone and to pronounce *rēgnṓ*, so long as they left to the first syllable of this word the full value of two *χρόνοι πρώτοι*; for in this case the time of the first syllable is sufficiently preserved, and a careful enunciation of all the syllables in terms of the time-unit, the *χρόνος πρώτος*, takes place naturally, with the help of the *μέση κίνησις*. We find, however, that the organizer of the Latin iambic excluded the pronunciation *rēgnō* from the inner feet of iambic dipodies, the feet upon which the rhythm of the verse depends (Dipodic law). This precaution does not mean that the poet had regard for the tone alone; it means rather that, in rhythmizing, he was unable to remove the primary tone of the popular speech and at the same time to reduce the irrational long from 2 to $1\frac{1}{2}$ *χρόνοι πρώτοι*, as the ancient theory requires; in other words, he was unable to reduce a tone-bearing long to the *time* of a vigorous short.² Similarly he was unable to reduce two shorts, the first of which bears the primary tone, to the *time* of one short, e. g. *ánimo*.

The cases which we have named represent nearly all the cases of the *direct* influence of the accent upon quantitative verse which are to be found in Latin poetry,³ if, for the purpose of a convenient summary, we may be permitted to include the phenomena of the Dipodic law under cases of *direct* influence. It is true that the theory of Ritschl, which is now so much in vogue with Plautine scholars, sees everywhere the *direct* influence of the

is used to designate the *mode of recitation*, and ἐν ἐξ. τόνῳ is something analogous to our 'in heroic strain'". The Greeks commonly include the verse-accent under the simple terms ῥυθμός, κίνησις, ποίς, βάσις. To the examples of βάσις in this use quoted by the Thesaurus, add Schol. B in Hephaest., p. 131 Westphal: οἷτος (sc. ὁ πυρρίχιος) δὲ κατὰ πόδα μὲν οὐ βαίνεται διὰ τὸ κατὰ πικρον γίνεσθαι τὴν βάσιν, καὶ συγχέεσθαι τὴν αἰσθησιν; cf. Cic. De Or. III 47, 182 iambum et trochaeum segregat ab oratore Aristoteles; . . . insignes *percussiones* eorum numerorum et minuti pedes. Thus the βάσις of the scholiast is evidently equivalent to Cicero's *percussio*, and Aristoxenus' ποδικὴ σημασία (Elem. § 31 W.; cf. Hendrickson, A. J. P. XX 199, n. 2).

¹ I. e. in song and *πλάσμα* to wholly withdraw it; in the *μέση κίνησις*, in general, to greatly weaken and obscure it.

² This is very largely also the explanation of Klotz, Grundz. 321 f., who speaks in more general terms of the tone-bearing longs as '*die schwersten Längen*'.

³ The observation made above (A. J. P. XXV 149), that "the republican accents are preserved in the verse of the dramatists", is to be interpreted in the light of this statement.

accent. This view is, however, certainly a mistaken one, and has gained the assent of very few technical metrists. Ritschl's great insight consisted in a clear perception of the fact that the Latin accent has profoundly influenced many of the chief Latin verse-forms, and he was not misled by the short-sighted attempts of some critics to explain this influence entirely away through the assumption of secondary causes; he was less fortunate, however, in his judgment of the *manner* in which the influence of the accent has been exerted. For, assuming that this influence was always direct, he concluded that the Romans took *pleasure* in the simple agreement of accent and ictus, and therefore sought to bring about this agreement in as many cases as possible. Unfortunately, these conclusions are not only at variance with the historical development of Latin verse-forms, as Ritschl's opponents have not failed to point out (e. g. W. Meyer, *Beobacht. d. Wortacc.*, p. 16 fin.; Vendryes, *L'intensité init.*, p. 87), but they attribute a false and unreal character to all the classical poetry of the Romans. For if agreement of accent and ictus was so eagerly sought by the Romans, it is difficult to see how they could have derived much genuine pleasure from a species of verse which consists mainly of disagreements.

A more correct account of the whole matter has been given by an eminent American scholar, Prof. M. W. Humphreys, who has published his conclusions upon the relation of accent and ictus, first in a Leipzig dissertation, *Quaest. metr. de accentus momento in versu heroico*, 1874,¹ and later in a paper "On Influence of Accent in Latin Dactylic Hexameters", *Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc.* IX (1878), pp. 39-58. In the violent clash of extreme opinions, these moderate and scrupulously exact studies of Prof. Humphreys seem entirely to have escaped the notice of the contending parties;² they constitute, however, in my judgment, one of the

¹ This treatise formed one chapter in a series of metrical studies, a considerable part of which Prof. Humphreys informs me he has never published. With this broad range of metrical study, Prof. H. naturally possessed a great advantage over those dissertationists who have written upon some single phase of the question.

² Strangely enough W. Meyer, who has discussed the same subject less successfully, *Zur Geschichte d. griech. u. lat. Hexam.*, *Sitzungsber. d. bayer. Akad.*, München, 1884, pp. 979-1089, and especially pp. 1033-1043, appears to be unacquainted with Humphreys' work, just as he was unacquainted with the earlier statement of the dipodic law by his own countryman, Draheim, in *Hermes* XV. Vendryes, who quotes other literature, l. l., 92 ff., shows a similar neglect.

most important contributions which has been made to the subject, and it becomes necessary to understand their full significance. We may summarize Prof. Humphreys' conclusions as follows: The earliest Roman poets made no effort whatever to produce agreement in the close of the hexameter, but, as a consequence of the marked uniformity of Latin accent, the structure of the verse caused agreement to occur in a great majority of the cases (e. g. $\frac{3}{4}$ of the cases in Ennius). "Consequently, in the course of time, when the ear became accustomed to this agreement, it appeared to be a property of the verse" (TAPA. IX 40), and later poets required that agreement should always occur in this place. Quite similarly, the predominant use of masculine caesurae generally produced disagreement in the first part of the hexameter; hence disagreement became the invariable rule in this part of the verse, and the masculine caesura alone was admitted as the principal caesura of the verse. Therefore the relation of ictus to accent in dactylic hexameters is to be regarded as an *artificial* relation, and as the result of *usage* or *convention*. In addition to these conclusions on the dactylic hexameter, Prof. Humphreys declares elsewhere (TAPA. VII 112) that the invariable or almost invariable agreement¹ which is found in the third foot

¹One of the questions which one might have expected W. Meyer to discuss in his voluminous but incomplete work, *Beobachtung des Wortaccentes*, is whether this agreement *really* exists. Since, however, he has overlooked this problem entirely, I wish briefly to discuss the question in the form, Did Phaedrus seek consciously to place a tonic syllable in the third arsis? Fortunately this question admits of a definite answer; for Phaedrus most freely allows a spondee or anapaest in the 4th ft., subject to the conditions of the dipodic law, and hence his verse-structure admits *térōr[em]* *héredis tui* just as well as *gauidi[um]* *héredis tui* (4, 20, 18), and *exili[um]* *úxoris peténs* just as well as *cūbicul[um]* *úxoris peténs* (3, 10, 21). According to L. Müller's ed. min. elision occurs in Phaedrus between the arses of the 3rd and 4th ft. (as in *quóni[am]* *indignos, córpor[e] et, vér[e] ad, hómin[i] ut*) 118 times in all, and in particular cases of the elision of trisyllabic words of the value $\text{—} \cup \cup$ (*péctore, péctōri*) occur 28 times. On the other hand, cases of the elision of trisyllabic words of the value $\text{—} \text{—} \cup$ do not occur at all in Phaedrus; for in App. 2, 4, where the ed. min. gives *quaecúmque indúgens Fórtun[a]*, the MSS have *quaecumque* (or, *q que*) *Fortuna*, and both Müller in ed. mai. and Havet read *quae cu/ Fórtuna indúgens*; also in App. 21, 7, where the ed. min. gives *cum circumspectans érror[e]*, the MSS have *orore* or *errore*, and Müller in ed. mai. reads *óre ita*, Havet reads *aéguor*, and Hartman *ómni[a]*. We have a right to assume that words like *audirem* are about as frequent in Latin as words like *audiam* and no more in demand in other parts of the verse than the latter; hence I conclude that Phaedrus

of the trimeter has arisen in the same manner. These clear and definite statements (especially *De acc. momento*, p. 2; *TAPA*. IX 40; VII 112) evidently afford a general law for the accentual development of all forms of Latin verse¹, and, to make the significance of this law perfectly plain, I venture to restate it in the following terms:— The Latin metrical cadences or verse-forms were originally constituted entirely without reference to accent, and solely in accordance with metrical laws; no sooner, however, had they assumed a definitive form in this way than they began to respond to the influence of the accent in accordance with a simple psychological law. In view of the uniformity of the Latin accentual system, the result of observing the metrical rules was to produce at certain points of almost every cadence, (1) agreement of accent and ictus in the great majority of cases, (2) disagreement of accent and ictus in the great majority of cases. Wherever this result is brought about, the Roman ear is quick to note the relation which usually exists and to require in the end, i. e. in the course of the historical development, that it shall *always* exist, that is, to require that the agreement or disagreement shall be made invariable; in other words, the Roman ear *remembers* the hexameter, Sapphic or trimeter cadences (τόνοι 'tunes', 'musical modes') at certain points by the relation which

*consciously sought to place a tonic syllable in the 3rd arsis and for this reason rejected the 28 examples of Fortun[a] which the verse-structure would naturally produce. We find also no cases of elision like *fixiti* [um], but 2 cases like *cūbīcūl* [um] (3, 10, 21; 4, 7, 13). [Observe that fourth paeon words like *cūbīcūlum* were wholly withdrawn from the 3rd arsis after 150 A. D., when the accent had fully changed to *cūbīcūlum*, cf. A. J. P. XXV 152, n. 1.] I may add that, in order to give the words in question their proper accent in the 3rd arsis, Phaedrus employs the rare latent caesura in *prolāps*[am] 3, 15, 6; *secrēt*[um] ib. 10, 11; *lānific*[am] 4, 5, 5. A long monosyll., however, is freely treated by Phaedrus as independently accented in the 3rd arsis, as 3, 14, 4 *quām* *deridendūs*, where composition would give *quam-dēridendūs*; so 4, 11, 14, et al.; cf. also 4, 12, 3 *prōpter virtut*[em].*

¹ An altogether similar view of the influence of the accent has been put forward by the well-known English scholar, H. A. J. Munro, in an extremely able article in the *Transactions of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, Vol. X (1864), pp. 374-402. Cf. especially p. 377: "I wish . . . to show that before the third century Latin verses of every kind, popular as well as learned, were written by quantity alone; that on the different kinds of metre accent had no direct influence at all; that however sometimes consciously, sometimes unconsciously, certain poets sought sometimes a coincidence, sometimes on the other hand a contradiction between the *ictus metricus* of the verse and the

they bear to the accentual cadence or melody, which is its simplest standard of measurement, its most familiar register. In those more numerous parts of the verse, however, where no usual relation was established, but the effect of observing the metrical rules was to produce sometimes agreement and sometimes disagreement, the metrical cadence remained wholly unchanged, wholly unaffected by the accent, so long as the Roman quantitative system endured.

I trust that I have now made sufficiently clear the real character of Prof. Humphreys' theory, which my own studies have led me to adopt with confidence, and, I may add, with a genuine sense of relief. For this theory appears to afford a genuine *via media*, and to neglect neither the historical development, as does the theory of Ritschl and Langen, nor the historical facts, as does the theory of Corssen and Meyer. It assigns some value and some potential influence to the Latin accent without, at the same time, destroying the genuine character of Roman poetry; it moves also among the legitimate ideas of ancient classical metric¹, instead of transporting us somewhat violently into the domain of modern German and English accentual verse. Above all, it does not involve us in the difficult and obscure psychology of '*harmonische Disharmonie*', that is, it does not compel us to believe with

accent". Cf. also p. 393: "Rhythm we have now seen was in Latin as in Greek quite independent of accent which had no direct influence on it whatsoever. But as quantity on which it rested was divided into various portions by caesura, pause and due arrangement of words, it well might be that in consequence of the limited range of the Latin accent it might gradually obtain a certain indirect influence over some parts of the hexameter, as of the iambic or trochaic: habit being all-powerful in this as in more important matters." It seems a curious accident in this branch of philological study that, while the scattered notes of Bentley upon Latin accent and quantity are widely known and often quoted, this study of Munro's, which is no less deserving of notice, should be generally neglected and apparently be unknown to the present generation of English scholars! I may add that the articles of Humphreys and Munro, which are wholly independent of each other and yet reach identical conclusions, serve admirably to supplement each other and consequently seem almost to exhaust all the important phases of the subject, leaving only minor questions of detail for future investigators. Humphreys offers a much more rigorous and strictly scientific proof, while Munro contributes to the question the wide range of exact knowledge and the great critical acumen which one naturally associates with the English editor of Lucretius.

¹ For examples of the 'conventions' of Sanskrit metric, cf. Bergaigne et Henry, Manuel Védique, p. 38 f.

Ritschl (Opusc. II, Leipzig, 1868, p. XII) that the Romans sought agreement in one part of the verse for the pleasure which it gave them, while in another part of the verse, and for the sake of an abstract balance or contrast, they sought with pleasure (*'suchten mit Wohlgefallen'*)—disagreement. In view of these merits, it seems not improbable that the theory of Humphreys and Munro needs only to be better known to meet with wide acceptance among metrical scholars; it is even probable that precisely this theory is already held by many Latin scholars in a somewhat indefinite form. In any case we may note the probable consequences that would be involved in its acceptance. We should be compelled to modify a part, at least, of those views upon Plautine verse, which have tended to prevail during the last twenty-five years, and we should not only have a solution of the accentual problem of classical verse, but should be measurably advanced towards a final solution of the closely allied problems, which relate to the real character of the earliest Latin verse and to the origin of the later rhythmical poetry.¹

ELMIRA COLLEGE, ELMIRA, N. Y.

R. S. RADFORD.

¹ See already the careful dissertation of Dr. J. J. Schlicher, *Origin of Rhythmical Verse in Late Latin*, Chicago, 1900, which, if it does not give a final solution of this problem, at least goes very far towards making such a solution possible.